

**Tactical Networks In-Service Engineering Activity
(TACNET ISEA)**

Source Selection Advisory Council Report

RFP: N66001-16-R-0118

SPAWAR®



***Systems Center
PACIFIC***

SPACE AND NAVAL WARFARE SYSTEMS CENTER, PACIFIC
CODE 41250

11 JUNE 2018

We, the undersigned Source Selection Evaluation Advisory Council members for RFP: N66001-16-R-0118, agree with the contents of the attached evaluation report.

Signatures

SSAC Final Report Prepared by:

(b)(6) SSAC Chairperson
Division Head, Code 41200

(b)(6) SSAC Member
TACNET Director/ISEA PM, Code 41250

(b)(6)

6-11-2018

(b)(6)

06/11/2018

The Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) has reviewed evaluation results from the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB). We have concluded the SSEB's evaluation process followed the evaluation criteria in Section M of the Request for Proposals (RFP) and the Source Selection Plan (SSP), and that the ratings were appropriately and consistently applied. An overview of the proposals is provided below to assist the Source Selection Authority (SSA) in making the Best Value Decision.¹

I. REFERENCES

- (a) Solicitation No. N66001-16-R-0118
- (b) SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD (SSEB) REPORT with Combined Rating Sheets N66001-15-R-0118 Tactical Networks (TACNET) In-Service Engineering Activity (ISEA) dated 5 June 2018

II. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

This report provides an explanation of the evaluation and findings of the Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) in the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) N66001-16-D-0118 for Tactical Networks In-Service Engineering Activity (TACNET ISEA). The Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this RFP established this SSAC on 27 September 2017 by approving the Source Selection Plan (SSP).

The SSA is Sharon M. Pritchard, the SPAWAR Systems Center Pacific (SSC PAC) Chief of the Contracting Office (CCO). The members of the SSAC are as follows:

Chairperson:	(b)(6)	Code 41200 Division Head
Member:	(b)(6)	Code 41250 TACNET Director/ISEA PM

B. Evaluation Criteria

The following evaluation criteria applies to the subject procurement in accordance with (IAW) provision M-TXT-06 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS FOR AWARD (BEST VALUE)(JUN 2017):

- (a) The contract resulting from this RFP will be awarded to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the RFP, is determined to provide the best value to the Government, which may not necessarily be the proposal offering the lowest cost, nor receiving the highest technical rating. Such offer may not necessarily be the proposal offering the

¹ This document provides only the SSAC's recommendations; the Source Selection Decision Document is the Business Clearance Memorandum "BCM." Additionally, the BCM will contain the Cost Analysis and Trade-Off analysis.

lowest cost or receiving the highest technical rating. One or more awards may be reserved for small business if one or more small business prime contractors are found to represent the best value to the Government in terms of both technical capability and cost reasonableness.

- (b) Proposals will be rated and ranked using a three-step methodology. Step One is an evaluation of: (a) Acceptability of the Offer; and (b) Capability (including Organizational Experience, Past Performance, and Small Business Participation). Step Two is an evaluation of the proposed cost. Step Three is a cost/technical trade-off analysis in order to determine the best value source selection decision.

Relative Importance of the Evaluation Factors

- The non-cost evaluation factors, when combined, are significantly more important than cost. However, the degree of importance of cost will increase with the degree of the equality of proposals in terms of the non-cost evaluation factors.
- Organizational Experience is significantly important than Past Performance and Small Business Participation.
- Past Performance is more important than Small Business Participation.

C. Proposals Received

The Government received three offers in response to the subject solicitation, which closed at 12:00 PM PST on 31 October 2017:

Proposals were received from the following offerors:

- **KOAM Engineering Systems, Inc. (KES)** (Small Business)
- **McKean Defense (McKean)** (Large business)
- **SAIC** (Large business)

D. SSEB Evaluation

The SSEB conducted a detailed review and evaluation of the proposals. Reference (b) provides a detailed evaluation of each offeror's proposal in comparison to the evaluation criteria detailed in provision M-TXT-06 of the RFP.

E. SSAC Evaluation

The SSAC convened on 21 February 2018 through 12 March 2018 to review and discuss the SSEB evaluations of each contractor's proposal. The SSAC reviewed the SSEB's findings and determined them to be accurate, consistent, and supported in accordance with the evaluation criteria in the RFP. The SSAC reviewed the evaluations, considered the advantages and disadvantages between offerors in each factor, and determined that strengths and weaknesses

were consistently applied to the merits of each offeror's proposal. Based on this review, the SSAC recommends award to SAIC.

III. SUMMARY OF THE SSEB EVALUATION

The SSEB's final evaluation ratings are summarized in the following table:

Offeror	Acceptability	Factor I Organizational Experience	Factor II Past Performance	Factor III Small Business Participation
KES	(b)(5)			
MCKEAN				
SAIC				

Note: Following the receipt

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

IV. STEP ONE (NON-COST) EVALUATION

IAW provision M-TXT-06, proposals were rated using a three step methodology. Step One was an evaluation of: (a) Acceptability of the Offer; and (b) Capability (including Organizational Experience, Past Performance, and Small Business Participation). The following paragraphs document how each offeror fared in terms of Acceptability and Capability.

Step 1(a) - ACCEPTABILITY: Offerors who met the following criteria were determined to be Acceptable IAW the RFP:

- Offer includes fully completed Standard Form 33, without any material omissions.
- Offeror has acknowledged all material amendments.
- Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B, without any material omissions.
- Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K, without any material omissions.
- Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions (e.g., for small business set-asides with provision 52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting, ensure that at least 50 percent of the cost of contract performance incurred for personnel shall be expended for employees of the concern).
- Offer does not impose any additional material conditions to RFP.

Step 1(b) - CAPABILITY: All offerors who met the criteria in Step 1(a) – Acceptability, were evaluated in Step 1(b) – Capability. IAW RFP Provision L-TXT-12, offerors that received a Marginal or lower evaluation rating in Organizational Experience were not further considered for

award. Therefore, offerors that received a Marginal in Organization Experience were not evaluated for Past Performance or Small Business Participation.

Organizational Experience (Factor I)

- See SSEB report for detailed evaluation of Significant Strengths, Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, and Weaknesses.

Past Performance (Factor II)

- See SSEB report for SAIC's evaluation of Recency, Relevancy, and Quality of past performance.

Small Business Participation (Factor III)

- See SSEB report for SAIC's total percentage of small business participation.

V. STEP TWO (COST) EVALUATION

IAW provision M-TXT-06, Step Two of the evaluation process was an evaluation of the proposed cost. The Contract Specialist was responsible for ensuring the cost evaluation was performed in accordance with the Source Selection Plan and applicable regulations. To that end, the contract specialist evaluated the proposed price and cost of each offer for realism and reasonableness in accordance with FAR subpart 15.4.

A detailed analysis will be contained in the Business Clearance Memorandum. However, a summary of the Contract Specialist's evaluation is contained below:

Offeror	TOTAL PROPOSED COST	FIVE YEAR EVALUATED (PROBABLE) COST
KES MCKEAN SAIC	(b)(3), 10 USC 2305g, (b)(4) \$196,526,884.00	(b)(5)

(b)(5)

SAIC proposed labor categories and indirect rates as the prime contractor that either matched or fell within an acceptable plus or minus two-hundredths (b)(5) of DCAA approved Forward Price Rate Recommendation (FPRR) for Contractor Fiscal Year (CFY) 2018-2022 dated 21 June 2017. Therefore, no cost realism adjustments were made to SAIC's direct or indirect rates as the prime. SAIC's proposal included (b)(4)

(b)(4)

(b)(4)

SAIC's overall price was realized up from \$196,526,884.00 to (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

VI. SSAC EVALUATION

The SSAC considered the advantages and disadvantages between offerors in Factor I Organizational Experience, and determined that strengths and weaknesses were consistently applied to the merits of each offeror's proposal. The SSAC reviewed the SSEB's findings and determined them to be accurate, consistent, and supported in accordance with the evaluation criteria. The SSAC evaluated (b)(5)

(b)(5)

VII. PRICE/TECHNICAL TRADE-OFF – STEP THREE

IAW provision M-TXT-06, Step Three was a cost/technical trade-off analysis in order to determine the best value source selection decision. (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) SAIC was selected as the only offeror whose proposal was analyzed by the contract specialist for cost realism, reasonableness, and recommendation for award. As the only eligible offeror, no price/technical trade-off with rankings was performed.

VIII. RECOMMENDATION

(b)(5)

(b)(5) SAIC is recommended for award on the condition that its cost are found by the SSA, as documented within the BCM, to be fair, reasonable, and in the best interest of the Government.